

Summary Minutes
City Of Sedona
Citizens Steering Committee Meeting -
Sedona Community Plan Update
Community Plan Room, 1725 West S.R. 89A, Suite D, Sedona, AZ
Tuesday, June 5, 2012 – 3:00 p.m.

1. **Verification of Notice, Call to Order, and Roll Call. Members of the Citizens Steering Committee will attend either in person or by telephone, video or internet conferencing.**

Chairman Thompson called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

Committee Members Present: Chairman Jon Thompson and Committee Members Mike Bower, Jim Eaton, Barbara Litrell, Marty Losoff, Gerhard Mayer and John Sather. Angela LeFevre, Elemer Magaziner, Judy Reddington and Rio Robson were excused.

Staff Present: Audree Juhlin, Kathy Levin, Cari Meyer and Mike Raber

2. **Public forum for items not listed on the agenda – limit of three minutes per person. (Note that the Citizens Steering Committee may not discuss or make decisions on any matter brought forward by a member of the public). (5 minutes for items 1- 3)**

Chairman Thompson opened the public forum.

Bill Welter, Sedona, AZ: Explained that a public engagement process is needed in this planning process before the public votes, so we don't have a big gap and have a greater sense of public participation and support, before it is actually put out for a vote. Bill then explained that Blue Sky Consulting is the firm that helped Wal-Mart go green, and they were retained by the City of Cleveland, Ohio in 2009 to create the "Sustainable Cleveland Summit". The byline created was "Building an economic engine to empower a green city on a blue lake", and their whole deal was basically how to turn Cleveland around and make it what they wanted it to be. The City of Cleveland paid \$100,000 for this document that employs a technique called "Appreciative Inquiry", and he will provide the Committee and Sustainability Commission with a copy, because we possibly could do something similar in Sedona as an intermediate step between a public information process and a vote process, since it focuses on gathering the community leaders into a three-day summit to discuss where they want to take the town. Additionally, they have a very strong follow-up program on-line, to evaluate two years later how you are doing, so he thought it might be useful.

Having no additional requests to speak, Chairman Thompson closed the public forum.

The Chairman noted that Announcements had been omitted from the agenda and advised Committee Members that they could include announcements during discussion of a related agenda item; however, Gerhard Mayer asked about an email received with a "mail saver notification indicating that this mail has violated the racial discrimination", and it was quarantined. Chairman Thompson noted that that the email was from Kathy Levin to all of the Committee Members. John Sather then explained that they have very high-level filters that almost nothing gets through, and that is a standard filter response. Kathy Levin indicated that she will give it to IT.

Marty Losoff then referenced a letter about the Community Plan that he saw in Sedona.biz and the person was kind of attacking it, but the nice thing was that the responses to that have been very positive, so he suggested that they read it.

3. **Discussion of the May 15, 2012 "neighborhood tour field trip" by the Citizens Steering Committee. (10 minutes 3:05 – 3:15 p.m.)**

Chairman Thompson explained that this item was put on the agenda to determine if there were any follow-up comments about the tour. Marty Losoff noted that the Chairman and Barbara Litrell deserve a lot of praise for the way the tour was orchestrated. Barbara then added that it was good that it was adaptable, so it could be cut, since it was more than could be handled, and the Chairman did a great job. Gerhard Mayer asked if there is a possibility that the Committee could see the sites that were eliminated.

Barbara Litrell noted that when she and Chairman Thompson were mapping out the tour, they were having observations and insights into the neighborhoods, and she left with a very different impression about the housing in Sedona and diversity of the housing and the apparent demographic make-up of Sedona and that diversity, based on the neighborhoods in this very small area of 18 square miles, and also how close everything is to 89A. When you are one block off of 89A, you are in residential and we think of 89A as a commercial strip, but one block off, it is a ranch practically in some places with horse property, so that was an eye-opener for her and it certainly has implications for her liaison work with the Housing Commission.

Barbara then asked if any others had their perceptions changed. Gerhard Mayer indicated that at some of the sites, he saw the potential for elaborate redevelopment to bring more beauty to it. It is just a matter of how to implement that and make it work, and what can be done in the short-term. If you look beyond, how long would it take to get the things done that were discussed in the planning, and what could be done in the short-term to not block any long-term development ideas? That is what he thought would be important for any future development or ideas that would be put out to the voters. Additionally, he doesn't know if they saw his statement about the land that the City owns that should be used or traded or sold to buy pieces to make the City Center happen, so we have control of those pieces and can get into a private/public partnership to make it commercially viable, as well as viable for the community.

Chairman Thompson indicated that he kind of knew this already, but it helped to see that there are very few apartment buildings or large condo constructs, which is to say that the density is just really not there for the most part. We have single-family homes and we have some of them on relatively small lots in large areas, but we have been hearing a lot from the public about wanting a more walkable community with more stores here and there that people can go to as a local place, and it is kind of like a Manhattan extreme, when you've got everything you would want and things that you would never do within a couple of blocks, because everything is so high, so when we talk with the public about our ideas, we need to try to elicit from them how we could make that work in an area that is relatively spread out. If we had big apartment buildings in several places, we could have those little centers, whether there are parks, retail centers, or shops, etc., and people could gather, but he wonders if we have the critical mass for the kinds of things people wish they had.

Gerhard Mayer added that the City has to create the environment to make things like that happen and not make it restrictive. The City should support it and give it priority, even for the larger apartment complex or whatever, but he doesn't think it should be a massive block, it could be spread out and fit into the design of the surrounding area, and that would be a great thing to do. Apartments are always needed; we always try to bring workers from the outside into the City and it would be a great idea to have something, not a dorm, but buildings that cater to this area, and he could see a lot of things, like terraced apartments, etc. It is just that the willingness and environment has to be there to get through all of the process.

Chairman Thompson pointed out that it is not just the City; the community would have to accept a more dense kind of Plan to get the critical mass to do some of these things. He is not saying that they would have to; he doesn't know what the studies are, but so far we have seen from previous plans that we don't want to have growth.

Jim Eaton indicated that it is not all going to be cured by relaxing restrictions. We need to maintain a balance, and if we can relax restrictions in one place in order to increase them in another place to maintain what the people want, that could be part of this. Most people don't want to look at big tall buildings here and they certainly don't want them blocking their views, but there may be places where this could be done, and in so doing, relieve the pressure of development someplace else.

Mike Bower indicated that in relation to the field trip, it was helpful, but he was a little disappointed to see the normal thing, which was a fair amount of people looking at their iPhones and stuff and not really listening to Kathy's comments about the history, so he doesn't want to sugarcoat it. He thought it was okay and it maybe stemmed from the idea of awareness walks as a community engagement technique, but this was our own internal overview of the town, so in that regard it was good; however in the future, we might take it to the streets a little more as a community involvement strategy, and when we have some change ideas or visions, we might structure a smaller little awareness walk, and he would suggest a full Committee not get on the bus, but something about being out in the environment really lets you feel it a little more. Regarding Chairman Thompson's comment, he doesn't think we have to generate density everywhere. Like Jim was saying, there is a balance and some places would stay totally exclusive, because they don't walk to a shopping experience at all, but as Barbara said, just a little ways off of 89A, we have residential, so there is a zone of residential that can walk to services on the commercial core and nobody's neighborhood really gets intruded upon, even with the neighborhood center. Then, there are a few neighborhoods, maybe at Harmony, that are interested in a neighborhood center and they might actually get a little walkable internal node that is a little market and community garden, etc., so when he and John Sather map the community comments, they will have to think that way, and that is why he said he wanted everybody's ideas, and the whole density thing doesn't apply across the board, but if we go out again on a tour or awareness adventure, we should do it on foot and with a specific feedback goal, so he feels good about the whole event. We should see it as a starting point to do more feet-on-the-ground work.

Marty Losoff indicated that the tour confirmed his thoughts that one shoe doesn't fit all for each neighborhood, and we can't impose something on one versus the other. Additionally, he was impressed in that we have had a lot of comments about parks, and he has felt that Sedona is one big park, so he isn't sure how many little parks are really needed. Harmony was talking about their own park, but if the roads and pedestrian walkways are such, theoretically and logistically, they are not that far from Soldier Pass, and if there was access to Posse Grounds, they could easily cut over and not need their own park, but to provide each community with a park is probably stretching it. We devise a Plan, and then each community comes up with what they want. Harmony is pretty well organized, but we can't say to each community that this is what you are going to do. We can say as a City, here is what we want to do, but you, the community, come up with your own little plan.

Gerhard Mayer indicated that in looking at the community and parks, etc., it kind of does what this whole community is all about, you know like staying in each of the little territories and we don't go out and communicate with the neighborhood; we have become little entities that are all by themselves. They all have the same interests, but we need to venture out and have a big place where we all get together -- all of Sedona or at least our area of Sedona. If Harmony has their own little community park, they are never going to reach out to another park, and if we have one in that area that other communities also go to, they can interact and that is what he would like to see, because everybody has their little world and they all stay in it and make it secure and safe, and they don't want to be bothered. They don't even know if a neighbor died unless the emergency truck shows up and the community feel is not there. We need to make that happen; it is our task to make that happen, because we are a whole community, even if we have diverse interests and incomes, etc.

Jim Eaton indicated this is why several months ago he suggested dividing the City into six to nine areas and have meetings in each of those areas -- not just with little neighborhoods or homeowners' associations, but the more major regions of the City to analyze what they want for their area. We can't think that one size fits all even for this small town.

Barbara indicated that she serves as the liaison for the Housing Commission to the Harmony neighborhood and that is one neighborhood in Sedona with about 500 homes and the greatest number of our Hispanic community and the greatest majority of our children, so regarding their request for a park in their neighborhood, they would like a place for the children to play until dark. It is a little bit different than some of the other neighborhoods around town, and we have to understand that it is like every child in your family needs different things; they need their individual differences and you need to be able to help them.

Gerhard Mayer stated that is why he would like to see a cultural center, not only for Hispanics, because we have other ethnic groups here as well. He then gave an example of a Hispanic man that he didn't talk to for over a year, because when the man was around other Hispanics, he only spoke Spanish and he lost all of his English, and we want them to integrate. Barbara Litrell emphasized that we may want them to integrate, but what do they want? Her grandparents didn't learn to speak English, so she is opposed to the idea that everybody has to speak English. Jim Eaton added that they shouldn't be made to feel that they are in a ghetto and Barbara pointed out that they don't feel that they are in a ghetto.

4. Discussion/possible action on the planning process beginning with a repeat showing of the presentation from the May 14, 2012 community event. (1 hour and 20 minutes 3:15 – 4:35 p.m.)

Chairman Thompson indicated that this item would start by re-showing Mike Bower's presentation from May 14th as background for this discussion.

Mike Bower noted that at that gathering, there were a lot of people that were ready to share their ideas and they may not have been aware that we were sort of moving past that phase, but we made this presentation to help explain what the Committee has been doing, so we summarized everyone's ideas, issues and comments. We also heard some questions asking if we can't just write the Plan from those, but if you try to do that by just using words to write the plan, there is a problem, so he used this as an example to portray that problem.

Mike pointed out that the Community Plan says, "Retain a distinctive ranch-style character" for a small tract of land on Schnebly Road and the problem is what the Zoning Ordinance entitles all that land to be. Zoning is entitlement and land use mapping is part of planning; zoning is an implementation tool for your Plan, but the Plan says to maintain a distinctive ranch-style character while the zoning says to make as many small houses as is feasible. It is the tightest lot zoning we have, so that nice little green zone wouldn't retain that distinctive ranch-style character.

John Sather explained that when we did the first Community Plan, one step that nobody dared to take is this step, which was to transform the zoning to really speak to the community. The actual Land Use Map for the first Community Plan was really nothing more than a tracing of the existing zoning, so there are all of these great words, but everybody could go back to rely on their rights, and this is the case, because nobody has gone in there and destroyed that opportunity.

Marty Losoff asked if there was a reason that it wasn't integrated and John Sather indicated yes, the boldness of the City Council, and Mike Bower pointed out that you run into a huge legal challenge, and currently there are even state challenges, but if you do a down-zoning, you will have attorneys all over the City, and our City was too young to take it, so he thinks what was done early on was correct. We had to take some baby steps, but what has happened is that we have kind of frustrated ourselves as time has passed, because people

say to just stick to the Plan, when we really have an assembly of words that doesn't line up with our zoning, so what we don't have is consensus, and this effort was talking about how we are going to find consensus, what we have been doing and what we are going to do to get there.

Mike Bower then explained that we said we have been grouping the list of things into primarily three categories. The first one is Community, the second one is Environment and the third one is Tourism, so we talked about what those things might be and what Sedona has decided it should be for residents. What if we really embraced "small town character" and based our decision-making on what would best nurture community relationships -- that is Community. For Environment, what if we embraced the preservation of the land, water, flora and fauna as Sedona's primary purpose and what if balancing the ecological footprint of residents and visitors became the prime criteria for evaluating change in the community - that is Environment. In Tourism, what if we decided that we were going to be the best of the best and created relationships, infrastructure and programs to fully embrace our role of hosting visitors?

Mike noted that a lot of the comments, issues and ideas received were grouped in those three different themes or three different ways of looking at our future; however, we have also seen some others like Arts & Culture, Small Town Character, Sustainability and Spiritual Community. Those are other groupings that you notice when you read through all of the comments and the important thing to realize is that none of these themes or groupings will win. We aren't going to try to create a Community Plan that just isolates one of these as Sedona's vision. Mike then gave an example indicating that if Sedona was to be the greatest tourism center in the world, we wouldn't be sustainable, so we obviously have to look for a balanced consensus vision and the Committee is going to take the three themes and see how we can get to that balanced consensus vision.

Mike then explained that to do that, the Committee is going to take the three themes and fill them out a little bit to try to look at what the land use looks like in a truly Environmental vision, so what would the Cultural Park look like in an Environmental vision and what would it look like in the Tourism vision? What would the economics look like in a Tourism vision and in a Community vision? If we flesh out a holistic view of each of the themes, we will be able to evaluate them and see how they compare, which will let us share opinions and understand different viewpoints to reach consensus.

Mike indicated that the Committee thinks this process is worth it, because one of the other things we heard from the community as a weakness or a constraint is that Sedona is an argumentative polarized place. He would like to put it as Sedona being a passionate place, but if we can craft a good process to get there, then hopefully, we will be able to come to consensus. The question is how we are going to do that and we said that we are going to look for those things in the sweet spot where those three themes -- Community, Environment and Tourism overlap. There are many ideas that serve all three and those are the sweet spots, and that will be one way that we can come to consensus.

Mike explained that there is a little bit of each of these other interesting things that also lead to sweet spots, such as the whole sustainability thing, arts & culture, and sustainability itself is going to be a way to come together in consensus. Not only did the Committee hear that in all of the kinds of meeting we had, there isn't an option these days. Communities don't get to decide that they don't want to be sustainable, so we know there will be consensus around those concepts.

Mike indicated that the other thing is where these themes overlap, and between Community and Environment, there are many ideas that have synergy. There is a body of arts & culture ideas that have synergy with Community and Tourism. They enhance our quality of life and they can enhance our visitors' experience. We have a lot of opportunities to find consensus and if we don't go through the dialogue and just write it up ourselves, we may

not address that weakness part that we haven't really learned to work together on and come to consensus. Ultimately, that would leave Marty Losoff in the same position he is in now on P&Z. It is awkward when we don't have consensus around a vision of what we should be and when there are 12,000 residents, there are 12,000 opinions, so we are shooting for something a little different.

Mike then indicated that something in a sweet spot is that we heard walkable community over and over, and that is a big component of sustainability, quality visitor-based experiences and community relationships. You don't learn to experience your town from behind the wheel of an automobile, when you are in a privacy shell and don't interact with people, and that is one small example, but something we can head towards.

Mike indicated that was the extent of his presentation, and for the Committee, it is some reinforcement as to why we are heading where we are heading, because we have had people trying to shape our tree, when they say don't do that, it will confuse people -- just go right to the balanced vision, but there are a lot of reasons not to do that. First, we don't know it yet, and secondly, we have to go back to the community for review and feedback. He and John Sather can tell you that when you are designing something for somebody, if you show somebody one idea, you might battle and battle, and then ultimately sell them on it, but you will be remodeling that one idea; however, if you start with a range of concepts, the feedback is much better and you oftentimes are "Frankensteining" a little bit, with a little from several ideas. There is some danger in doing that, but if you are conscious when you do it, you can also engender buy-in from the general public, because they feel like they have helped author it and you can get magic from the ideas that you might not see if you jumped to the finish line, so we are doing this today to reinforce to ourselves that we are on the right track and it is okay to evaluate that feedback and question it.

Jim Eaton indicated that he missed the May 14th presentation and asked if this is what followed Chairman Thompson's introduction and Mike Bower stated yes, plus they showed some slides from the previous presentations, talked a little more about some of the ideas that share the balanced sweet spots, and talked about the Jackson Laboratory example, which is the research lab that relocated to Mount Desert Island, because it was a beautiful place and their employees would be happy there. People say that Sedona can't have any large scale alternatives to Tourism, in terms of an economic driver, but that is not true. We just didn't go after ASU's branch campus, so Payson got it.

Chairman Thompson indicated that the really good thing about this was that we had a large group there and they hadn't gotten their ice cream yet, but you could feel the fact that everybody was behind us. Everybody really responded very positively, so it was one of the most relieving moments he has had in almost two years on this Committee.

Barbara Litrell asked what he heard and Mike Bower explained that he wrote a lot of what he heard and a lot was the same stuff we had been hearing, because these people hadn't been to a lot of the other meetings, so a lot of them were throwing out their thoughts and ideas for the future. A few of them like Ernie Strauch, who has attended most of the other meetings, commented on the process we were explaining, and he said, "Crystal clear, great way to go, and if you do this, you will be guiding our community in a good way". We also had quite a bit of excitement, but in general, everybody felt like it was clear as to where we were heading and why.

Chairman Thompson stated that the perfect thing was putting the three different plans together in that way and talking about the intersections and commonality, because people could see that regardless of those three perspectives, or maybe if there was even a fourth one, it could be heard, but only to the degree that it would work towards creating one out of them, so it is going to help include more people by having these different alternatives, but at the same time they will know that it will go towards one thing.

Gerhard Mayer indicated that one couple he knows was really excited about the presentation and the project, etc., and then they asked how we were going to pay for all of that, so that will be a big question. Mike Bower pointed out that it is critical that the Committee know how to answer that question and he asked if Gerhard Mayer had an answer for that. Gerhard indicated that he had suggested talking about it later, but he would answer that the people have to vote for it first.

Mike Bower indicated that he would like for all of the members of the Committee to internalize that we are planning on private property, and asking how we are going to pay for it comes from a perspective that thinks we are only planning parks, roadside beautifications, right-of-way improvements, and acquisition of lands for city halls and/or community centers, and that is only one small part of it. We are really trying to generate the synergy and the concepts that will help Harmony create a neighborhood center, a community garden and a more cohesive environment, and the town doesn't have to pay squat for that, but the town has to lay out some of the rationales and the vision, so it can be supported by other members of the community, and so the Councilors can feel that support and do what needs to be done, which may not be doling out a dime -- it may just be a change of law to allow mother-in-law apartments or a small retail shop to locate in the center of Harmony, if it doesn't have parking and just serves coffee and newspapers where people gather to share things. Additionally, he and John Sather showed a slide from their first presentation showing a little plaza and some development around the plaza, and then there is a picture of what a plaza is -- it is surrounded by active uses, has some shade, people gather there, etc., and they had said to imagine that is Basha's shopping center, because it is about the same size, and imagine that the Plan says that we want one of the string of pearls there and we want a branch library as a community building component with housing up above and maybe some lodging, and we want active retail below, and imagine that if a developer sees that vision, loves it, buys it and wants to build that, the way you pay for the public square is the developer pays for it and gifts it to the City fee simple and agrees to maintain it under the Development Agreement. The City has celebrations there and it is felt to be a vibrant public place for the community, so the concept of fee simple and gifting it back to the community is critical, but it is magic money from laying out a vision that the developer likes and wants to be part of.

Marty Losoff indicated that in terms of the planning process, he thinks the slide presentation is terrific and we should use it going forward, because it is a great introduction, and now we are going for what he has heard for the last year, that the community is ready to respond to something and we aren't giving them anything specifically to respond to. We keep saying that we aren't ready, and we keep saying that we have to get the community involved, so he is going to suggest that we put together a rough draft of a Plan and let the community react to it at meetings, etc. He likes the idea of the summit, because that has been lacking in some of our discussions. Early on, we stayed away from the constituencies, but we are lacking in getting community leaders together to really talk about some of the issues. If we aren't ready to do that, he wonders if it is too late to do some kind of survey. We think we know what the community wants; we've had all of these meetings and, except for the last one, most of the same people showed up. He is hearing different things from people he has talked to and some common elements like walkways, creekwalk, etc., and a volunteer for the Chamber indicated that for Tourism, one of the first things tourists ask for after restaurants and hikes is how they can get down to the creek, so there are some common things that Mike covered nicely, but at this stage of the game, he thinks we need to be specific. Chairman Thompson noted that we do have a plan that we will discuss in a second.

John Sather indicated that relating to the question about how we pay for this, we haven't defined what we are paying for; there is no proposal on the table, so whatever that is, there are at least three ways of paying -- one is that we are paying through the taxes collected that go into the City coffers, another is through the Plan we are shaping opportunity to provide prosperity to others and that is a perfect example. Basha's is a complete loss of

economic development and missed opportunities; it is an abomination sitting in the middle of town, where something like the upper part of that slide could be Basha's and we could have an incredible center that would make the shops more prosperous and people would want to go there, and the third way is missed money out there. He was recently stunned at the money that is out there that other communities go after that may fit into one, but not all of these dominant themes. The one for environmental and land acquisition funds is incredibly healthy and we just don't have the structure nor the intelligence to go after it, and those are just three ways that he knows, so he isn't going to be hampered by somebody that might propose a land tax. Gerhard Mayer indicated that he also sees some other ways of financing and it would be great if the City had control of some major pieces of land, then we could bring in some private/public partnerships.

Chairman Thompson indicated that the Committee should now focus on where it should be going from here, and last week he and Kathy Levin met with Mike Bower and John Sather to discuss where we should be going, and the highlights were that we all felt that the way we need to go is for Mike and John to do a lot of work, and they are willing to do it. We have talked about wanting the three plans laid out on big boards that we can take to the community, and we don't really want to debate whether or not we are going to put them in shopping centers or go out to the community or both -- that is another discussion, but we are going to do the boards that we can show to the community. We have some work that the Idea Teams did and that is a good start, but in some ways, it wasn't what we hoped it would be in that it didn't fill in all of the blanks, and some weren't done as well as others, so it isn't like we can just plop those on boards. Mike and John indicated that they just need to spend a lot of time together, to put these together with the Committee's oversight and input, so the thinking is that they need to work as quickly as they can, but not to push it so it isn't going to work, and then for them to tell us how they want us to respond, so we are going to do everything we can to draft them, like a bicycle rides behind a big truck, while they do their own drafting for the next month or two to create these boards. We will be in constant touch with them to let us know what feedback they need, etc., and we know that we need to flesh out the "visions" part of it, which is part of the exercise later today.

John Sather indicated that he won't say that Marty Losoff is confused, but he doesn't want the Committee to lose its way. These circles are on the wall and we need to create this diagram, so we are proposing to use this "poster" concept for the three themes -- Mike Bower added, "Community, Environment and Tourism". John Sather then explained that they will incorporate bits and pieces of what has been developed, new material that he and Mike cook up, with the Committee editing the information, and then they will take those on a road show and through whatever community participation method we choose to seek input from the community. After that step, they will go to the "upper one", which has always been the plan, so there is just a lot of work to do, and he and Mike have discussed how they are going to devote their time to do it; he thinks they have a rough visual path as to how it looks. John then referenced the summation of big ideas in the packet and indicated that for today, he thinks they want less words and more simple policy concepts that can be put on the table with these. They wanted to poll people to see if there are things missing, because as Chairman Thompson pointed out, we have vetted, organized, edited, etc. all of the public's comments, and his point was what we haven't heard in these three themes that we should think about and put out there to test.

Mike Bower explained that what John was pointing to represents the big presentation boards and that is also a representation of one of the boards, and they will include a pretty serious mapping and drawing, by taking these ideas and components and showing how they apply to a place, so in Tourism, we might "ground" that idea in Uptown and in Community, we might "ground" it in West Sedona, or in his own community focus, he "grounded" the main square in Uptown, because if we are really about Community, why give Uptown to the tourists only? Somebody has to make some decisions to take these words and "ground" them on a big map, so he wants to reinforce that he and John are going to work hard on "grounding" these ideas on a map to create something for people to

get their teeth into, and they are going to be able to draw from an abundance of words, because they envision everybody participating and getting their personal interpretations of these up here for us and "us" means the bigger "us". He and John will be busy mapping and will probably need help from other Committee Members to articulate a key component, so there is work ahead and something he was frustrated about is that our Committee meetings tend to be a lot of reactive comments that are good, but we are at the point when Marty handed out the cars; we were really still armchair quarterbacks at that time and now is the time to get on the field.

Chairman Thompson indicated that the first thing we can do to help Mike and John get started is to look at these statements in the packet, and in his first pass, he put in the tan color the ones that he thought were the biggest ideas, but as John Sather pointed out, there are big ideas that aren't in here potentially, so the first job is to take 10 minutes with each of these three ideas and see if we can give them the big ideas for each of them. If we come up with nothing, we will default to the brown, because they are going to do something or come up with their own and ask us if it is okay.

Jim Eaton indicated that so far what we got from the public in all of the meetings is mostly reduced to a wish list, and there are some good wishes, some wishes that aren't worth the paper they are written on, and some wishes that conflict with each other, so somewhere in this process, we have to begin to prioritize these, and the other half of the page Gerhard was on is how do we pay for it, but we don't pay for it all at once -- we prioritize and do things as we can in a logical sequence as opportunities arise for either City funding opportunities or private funding opportunities.

Chairman Thompson pointed out that is another way of saying what we are doing here, because we are coming up with the top priorities; we're not prioritizing everything. The Chairman then suggested looking at Tourism. We have 13 different items, many that are summaries of what the community said, but out of those, he identified the following as the biggest ideas listed:

- Learning Center
- Preserving and Protecting the Scenic Values
- World-class Conference Center
- Addition of an art museum, performing arts venues, revival of the Cultural Park, a film museum and events
- Jordan Road is a walking route with galleries and cafés, part of an "art triangle" in Uptown.

The Chairman then asked what else about Tourism should be included and Marty Losoff indicated that the following items should be added:

- Item 13, "Regardless of the reason visitors come to Sedona, they will leave equally impressed by the community spirit and small town character, from the small business atmosphere and unique independent shops, to the vibrant street community, to the cross-generational gatherings along the creek and at the parks, and to the lively festivals and celebrations at central and neighborhood plazas", should be the entrée to Tourism.
- Item 3, "A variety of hiking and biking trails are available and accessible to all ages and abilities, including seniors and handicapped, with ample parking at trailheads", should be a highlight.

Marty added that the 13 items capture everything on Tourism, but he would emphasize item 13 as our vision. Chairman Thompson then noted that really describes our community, so that the community itself is a tourist destination, and that could be a big idea.

Barbara Litrell indicated that the following is extremely important:

- Item 7, "The area's spiritual and wellness values are further developed and promoted to broaden the appeal of the area for those seeking personal growth, alternative healing arts, and inspiration", since it tends to be the underpinning of everything in Sedona, and often people indicate that they felt something when they got here -- it is that spiritual underlying thing here and some people come just for that. She thinks it is one of the biggest drivers for people coming to Sedona, so that whole concept of spiritual and wellness values is of major importance in what we are as a visitor and resident community.

Chairman Thompson asked Barbara if she would rate that higher than a conference center or learning center and Barbara indicated yes, it is one of those things that she has learned underlies so much of what else goes on here, and we tend to not talk about it. The Chairman noted that it is something that is unique about us as a tourist destination. Barbara indicated that Ichi Lee's "Call of Sedona" is a number one bestseller in Japan and Korea, and it was number six on the New York Times list, and it is all about his moment of enlightenment and there are calls to the Chamber, etc., from people who want to go to those places.

John Sather identified the following things that he thought was missing under Tourism:

- That there is an underlying welcoming and people feel welcome when they come here.
- We entertain the notion of a Tourism Development Commission to be constantly focused on the quality of our tourism.
- Tourism paths or choices - what would draw them here and make them come back. Tourism could be divided into different categories, such as agricultural tourism, medical healing tourism, spiritualism, hiking and biking, arts & culture, culinary, etc. People think of Napa as wine, but the French Laundry, the finest restaurant in the United States is in the middle of that.
- Green architecture - we could become a place to come and appreciate the architecture and natural environment.
- The culinary path
- "Museums" would be a much more substantial development of infrastructure and would deal with things like a Red Rock Discovery Center or significant museum structures that would be a significant cost.
- Entertainment zones and hospitality education are missing

Marty Losoff indicated that he liked the entertainment zone idea and Chairman Thompson indicated that what struck him about the different paths was that they aren't that different in a good way. The same people who might come for a culinary experience might also want a hiking experience, etc. They aren't the people that want to come to a theme park or water park. John Sather stated that he is trying to keep his mind in book-ends in that we are trying to develop under this dominant theme of Tourism, with the delivery of high-level deliberate tourism, so under the economic development side of it, you could say that we have no agricultural tourism, but if you add his little farm and the one that Max described on Schnebly and a few others and get on the front page of the Republic, people will come up to see the farms of Sedona, and if that is perfected, it has created an economy, a path, and a high delivery of tourism.

Jim Eaton indicated that yesterday he attended the second meeting of the group the Mayor calls the "movers and shakers" and it is focused primarily on arts & culture. Most of the people there were involved with Yavapai College, which has a lot more possibilities than we give it credit for. They went to Yavapai College and looked at their facility and to Verde Valley School for a fantastic lunch by Lisa Dahl, who was there because of the culinary arts, and then they went to the Mary Fisher Theatre, but they talked about all of the possibilities mainly centered on arts & culture that would bring in tourists, and there was more talk about the wine business and its impact on Sedona. Yavapai College has the

potential to solve a lot of the problems we've identified, if they can solve the problem of their geographic confines.

Marty Losoff asked if Jim is suggesting adding wine to the list; however, Chairman Thompson noted that it falls under culinary and Barbara indicated it also falls under agriculture. John Sather pointed out that when we talk about that, it has to be in terms of our incorporated boundaries and regions, because we won't have too many vineyards in Sedona. We will depend on the Verde Valley for the primary part, and then we will compete with other cities that all have their eyes on it also. Chairman Thompson indicated that they will visit there and stay here, so let's have the culinary institutes and great restaurants. John Sather added that he agreed and that is how someone can explain the regional concept to the citizenry.

Marty Losoff indicated that he would highlight "entertainment zone"; if we had an entertainment area with monthly activities or music, arts, etc., it would draw people. John Sather shared that on Saturday night, it was rocking and rolling by the Chinese restaurant and in Uptown, and his wife indicated that it looked like everyone was on the verge of dancing. People were in the outdoor dining areas and there were a ton of people.

Gerhard Mayer indicated that several years ago he proposed a study and one of the articles he added to it was about emphasizing quality. The goal should be to bring more quality here. The average stay is 1½ days, and he would bring in more resorts like Enchantment and emphasize Sedona as a brand for spas and wellness resorts, an international art academy, and multipurpose grounds for rodeos and equestrian events. Hopefully, we won't be a Santa Fe, but it is a vibrant community for every age group.

Barbara Litrell indicated that from a tourism standpoint, there are a couple of things that we don't capitalize on and that is our cowboy culture, and people think of us that way with places called the "Cowboy Club" and the "National Day of the Cowboy", so that is something that really can be developed by just looking at some more cultural activities that can bring people to Sedona. Another one is that someone wants to do a Yoga Festival in Sedona, which fits with the wellness, etc., so with those general categories, there are ways to put them on the ground very specifically.

The Chairman added that in a way the "cowboy-ism" feel is antithetical to the more New Age spiritualistic kind of thing, so it is something that needs to be put out there to address with the community, in terms of the feel of it, because he doesn't know that we could pull off both. John Sather noted that he lived here when there were cattle grazing in his yard, so there is a history here. He recently sat through an economic development presentation to the Apache Tribe on the value of cowboys and Indians, and the Apache is a brand that is international, so the speaker was talking on the international appeal of the cowboy and it was stunning as to how many people come to Arizona because of the cowboy.

Jim Eaton indicated there has been a lot said about the value of cultural heritage tourism and those tourists stay longer, spend more money and have less real impact on the community, and we do have a cowboy heritage. Chairman Thompson explained that he isn't denying that, but if you want a theme . . . Marty Losoff then interrupted to ask if we are going to debate each one or just throw them out and John Sather stated that he and Mike will sort through them.

Marty Losoff indicated that he is really concerned that we are just creating another list. John Sather then explained that it is a list of what is missing and his point is that if we want to discuss festivals, we need to talk about a festival that only we have and no one else ever can have; otherwise, it will be cannibalized. The Film Festival is a classic one; it is certainly a big deal here, but also in every city now, so you have to ask how much life it really has. Mike Bower indicated that the way you localize it is to encourage a film school and local filmmakers, which we have done.

Mike Bower then added that he is good with ongoing dialogue, even though we started digressing a little bit, because ultimately we have to wing out to the community a tourism-themed vision, and it has to have relevance to Sedona, so regarding what John brought up about festivals, 12,000 tickets were just sold to the Blue Grass Festival in Telluride next week and that is going to destroy the town. It destroys the sense of community and we don't have the ability to do that. Marty Losoff stated that is not necessarily true and he would say that it would enhance a sense of community; however, Mike explained that the "anywhere, anyplace festival" is out on its own in the ethers, and in the sweet spot between Community and Tourism and between Environment and Tourism, there are two other festivals. In Environment and Tourism is it the Hummingbird Festival that people were talking about, and between Community and Tourism is it the Cowboy Festival? We have to have some ideas; if we don't have some ideas that diagram doesn't mean squat, and if he and John generate all of the ideas, you are going to take pot shots at them forever; we all need to do this.

John Sather indicated that in putting everything about tourism on the table, it is how we create the extremely fine delivery of the word "tourism", because we don't do it well now. The workings of other cities like Scottsdale are really incredible, so we aren't just making a list to keep making lists. We are looking for the idea that should float to the top if we really believe in tourism as a dominant theme, then it is really as good as we can make it, and we are going to really have to flush our brains to switch to the next one, because there won't be any festivals.

Chairman Thompson suggested instead of saying that we don't do tourism well, which some people will argue, we say that we aren't doing it up to our potential. We have great ideas for how to do tourism well and they are so good, if they are presented properly, we will have people who are anti-tourism saying that they can live with that, but if we start by saying that we aren't doing tourism well, a bunch of people will say they have to fight it.

The Chairman then indicated that he wanted to do a reality check, because the Committee won't get through all three themes today. He then asked if they were comfortable with just getting the Tourism input and doing the other two later. John Sather expressed interest in plowing through the other two and indicated that as he and Mike get into these, people can talk to them. We are looking for high-level ideas that aren't on the list. The chairman suggested that the group go to Community then.

Marty Losoff asked if housing should be addressed in a different term and if Sedona wants affordable housing. Let's put it on the table and see if the community really wants affordable housing. He isn't saying that we do or we don't, but we hear enough and it is such a controversy that whenever we talk about it, we are going to be split, so maybe we can use the Community Plan to help us determine what direction we are going and if the community wants it or doesn't want it. Chairman Thompson suggested that another version of that question is if it is possible to get affordable housing. On the tour, we saw a lot of houses that anywhere else would be considered affordable housing and they aren't affordable because of the land values. If we do any of this other stuff halfway decent over the next 10-20 years, this place is going to be so valuable that land will double again, so we may never be able to get there and . . . Marty Losoff interrupted to say that we aren't debating this subject; we are just tossing it out.

Mike Bower indicated that there is an answer to Chairman Thompson's observation -- Guesthouse Overlay Zones. People were saying the same thing in 1991 or whenever this was done, and we said it is pretty common. In Flagstaff, it is called ADUs, Accessory Dwelling Units. Mike Raber clarified that Sedona also has ADUs and Mike Bower proceeded to say that when you can create some density by doing that, you can create some walkability and rent structures with smaller units, smaller rents, etc. He thinks it is wrong to just jump into saying that nobody can afford to do affordable housing in Sedona; you just have to do it differently.

Marty Losoff stated that he is just suggesting that we put it up as part of the Community Plan process -- do we want to ask the question to see if this is something the people want to debate. Mike Bower pointed out that question has already been asked and answered from his awareness of the community, but if you don't think it has, maybe we do need to keep it as a debate, although it came out in all of the meetings as comments and we have a Commission established for it, so we still have a lot of "Jonesing" over it. People are really worried that affordable housing might taint what our town is supposed to be, so obviously, with that "Jonesing", we are going to get some ongoing dialogue, but we are clearly directed to include it, maybe in all of these, and in Tourism, it is . . . Marty Losoff interrupted to say that John Sather asked what is not in there and he is just throwing something out that he thinks could be addressed.

Jim Eaton stated that the question has been asked, but it was asked mostly in a way that people thought they had a vote as to whether they wanted it or not, and they didn't consider how it might be provided and what the need might be. John Sather stated that under Community, we should look for significant provisions of all community needs in the areas of retail, health and welfare, so it answers the question, "Can I buy socks here?", "Can I get the kind of healthcare I need here?", "If I'm underprivileged, can I get those services here?", so under Community, those are three main sensors and there are probably more. Then, it is the whole big idea of diversity of the economy to make us a more well-rounded community, and that policy may be to develop an Economic Development Department and to develop high quality educational systems on all levels. He got into a debate about how terrible our educational system is and he was freaked out about his tax bill and what we pay for our school system, so you could say that for everything from OLLIE to charter school kindergartens, we do a job, but he isn't sure that it is perceived to be really high quality. Lastly, we should look at neighborhoods as the organizing structure of this plan and define the neighborhood and go out from there.

Barbara Litrell added that on the housing, she doesn't know if Audree is going to cover this later or not, but yesterday at the Housing Commission meeting, Sandy Moriarty read from the State Community Planning document that said that a city of 10,000 or more. . . (She then noted that it was going to be explained later). Barbara then indicated that there is a national document that communities can measure themselves by and it was used in the Harmony neighborhood. They just did an assessment with NAU of whether or not they are a healthy community, and it was based on things like their perceptions of safety in their community, access to education, access to healthcare, etc. There are 10 items that they measure communities on, so she will get a copy, because the question is if we are excelling in those areas or not. It is a national program and was used in order to get the assessment of Harmony, and the hospital is very excited about what it means in terms of a community. They had a healthy community in all of these areas, such as, "Do people feel supported?", "Do they feel neighborhood, etc.?" Then, you have a physically healthier community, so they are kind of tied together and she will get a copy.

Gerhard Mayer repeated his interest in a multicultural center or some sort of indoor gathering place, and Marty Losoff asked if that is number 13. Gerhard Mayer indicated that he didn't know if it is in there, but he would also like to get the youth of this community to serve in the government on an advisory board to the City Council.

Mike Raber asked if John Sather and Mike Bower wanted to have specifics that came through the Planning Teams pointed out that might relate to these and John Sather stated, "Anything, but we are looking for new information -- missing ideas". Mike Raber then suggested perhaps clarifying what came out of that, because some key elements that came out of the Planning Teams were brought up, such as an educational component at the Cultural Park. John Sather pointed out that they know that one -- he has this diagram and the three dominant themes plus he has "all" down below, so for instance, under his vision of Environment, there is no Cultural Park -- it is gone and has been re-vegetated and it is

owned by the City or given back to the Forest Service, so when you say "all", it might not be in all, but it might be in two.

Mike Raber indicated he is just wondering where those all are going to end up and whether they wanted opinions on that. John Sather suggested just jumping in and not debating it. Chairman Thompson stated that one idea was the whole interplay between neighborhoods versus central community. We hear people voice that we need a community center where we can all come together, and we can have multicultural density or whatever, but it is like big enough for everybody to show up, and then the string of pearls idea keeps coming up, so somehow what we put out there for the community has to show those two different aspects, so people can respond to liking the idea that their neighborhood is distinct or they can go to other neighborhoods for different kinds of experiences or they can say that they like the idea of the thing in the middle, where we can all come once or twice a week for big things that are happening or both.

Mike Bower agreed, but added that it isn't even if they want both; it is a hierarchy of public spaces that create a good community. Like the park consultants are now looking at a hierarchy of parks from pocket parks to neighborhood parks to regional parks to community parks, and in public spaces, there is a similar hierarchy and the big overall town square gathering spot is a spot for community celebrations, but the little corner gathering spot might be called a third place in sociological terms. Home is first place, work is second place and third place is just informal gathering places where more localized people meet and chat, but in a healthy community, there is a hierarchy of public spaces, so if we are really going to focus on community and make it the best we can, the real answer is just educating ourselves on the need for a whole hierarchy of public space; it isn't voting for a main one versus neighborhood ones. You really need them all to have the best focus on Community. The idea of Community is having chance encounters and sharing thoughts; it doesn't happen the way we circulate, because we aren't on a bus together, etc. It could happen in your living room, but not randomly enough. The whole idea of community, having interaction and learning about issues, etc., occurs in public spaces. Chairman Thompson noted that he doesn't disagree; he knows something on there is going to have a town center concept, but he also wanted to be sure that there is something for people that want to push neighborhood identities or neighborhood values as well.

Mike Bower indicated that when Marty Losoff threw out the idea of quality of our community as one of the things that attracts tourism, he started thinking, because in Community there is a balanced hierarchy of public space from the corner gathering spot to the large celebration spot for parades, etc., and in Tourism, he thought it might be relegated to the event spaces and let the neighborhoods go by the wayside, but with Marty's comment, the quality of the community is like heading towards the sweet spot, and that is the balance where it nurtures community and visitation. Marty Losoff added that at the Chamber, a lot of tourists ask where the real estate offices are, and Mike Bower then indicated that as it relates to public space, when we build these, we still may elect to build a little caricature bias into them. We could push them, because there are water slides, etc., in Tourism, but we decided no, that is bogus; however, we still may push a little bit of an extreme theme into them, and in Tourism, we can downplay neighborhoods and neighborhood centers and up-play central gathering spaces. Then in Community, we can up-play neighborhoods as the organizing structure for the town and the public gatherings in smaller neighborhood centers.

John Sather indicated that the point is that he doesn't fully expect that we will jump to four, like a whole new clean sheet of paper. For instance, he had a conversation with a woman who would truly be in the Environment camp in that we would really begin to slow down tourism, buy significant parcels back, re-vegetate the Cultural Park and look at our footprint, but he also knows that those who have no reason to be involved in tourism could care less about that, unless it means that it doesn't pay for what they need, and under that, we start

looking at a diversified economy and calibrate this a little bit, because not too many people can say that we aren't squarely in the lap of one right now.

Chairman Thompson suggested moving on; we didn't really finish Community, but we may pick it up again next time, and Mike Raber suggested that in the interim, the Committee Members can give staff their thoughts on what is missing and staff can make sure that Mike and John have access to that. The Chairman also noted that John Sather and Mike Bower were going to provide their work schedule, so others can sit in and observe.

5. Discussion of city policies regarding in-lieu fees and land acquisition for housing and their relationship to the Community Plan. (20 minutes 4:35 – 4:55 p.m.)

Mike Raber explained that the Housing Commission has been working on a map to designate areas of the community that could be acquired to provide for housing, and the map is required by state law, if City funds are used, and the City funds would come from the in-lieu fees, which are paid by developers. This issue came up in April during announcements, and it was decided to put it on an agenda, so Audree Juhlin is here and she has worked with the Housing Commission and can talk about that program. Our observations are that this is a very specific implementation program and not really a Community Plan issue, but we wanted you to understand it better.

Audree Juhlin explained that in-lieu fees come to the City based on Development Agreements from rezoning requests, and when the City Council approved the use of \$200,000 during this current budget cycle, the Commission began looking at how we could go about using those funds and acquire land. In that process, we learned that there is a state law that says the use of public funds for the purpose of housing must have a Housing Development Area Map designating those areas where the funds can be used, so the Commission had a joint meeting with the City Council in January and discussed the need for this map, if we were going forward to look at land acquisition, and the Council directed the Commission to develop a map and not target certain areas, but look at the full community and see where the most likely areas for this kind of housing would be. Then, the Housing Commission identified the areas in white as the areas that may be appropriate for this type of housing. The state law has the condition that no more than 20% of the land base within the city limits can be included in the Housing Development Area, so the white areas total about 16% and they hit all areas of the community.

John Sather asked about the criteria for developing that and Audree Juhlin explained that the Housing Commission looked at areas that were more affordable areas or areas that were at the median price range or below. They also looked at properties that would be close to highways or public transportation, not be located within a gated community, be where CC&Rs would support this type of housing, and be areas with appropriate zoning designations, multi-family zoning designations, smaller lot sizes, higher densities, reasonable proximity to amenities, schools, parks, shopping, etc., and then areas that might be right for rehabilitation, renovation, replacement homes, etc., as well as those that already have existing infrastructure.

John Sather indicated that "this kind of housing" almost sounds like a derogatory term and asked Audree to define that. Audree explained that it is housing that is specific to an income target group, so they look at the Area Median Income, of 80% or less. Marty Losoff asked what that is and Audree Juhlin explained that Coconino and Yavapai are different and she thinks Coconino is about \$54,000 per year and Yavapai is about \$50,000 per year. Gerhard Mayer asked what occupations would pay that kind of money and Audree Juhlin indicated it is basically the middle class citizens, not the lower income person working as maintenance in lodging; they wouldn't be able to qualify. Gerhard Mayer indicated that is the kind of people that have to commute all the time and Audree Juhlin agreed, but pointed out that the middle income workers commute as well. Gerhard Mayer then stated that the jobs are here and that is why they can make that money. In Cottonwood, they probably

can't make that. Audree Juhlin agreed and noted that is one of the biggest frustrations, if we are truly going to address the need for affordable housing, and based on your earlier discussion about the reality of being able to do that, we have to think of it differently, because it can be done, but with a different mindset in how it is approached.

Gerhard Mayer then asked if the population for affordable housing would be catering to the service businesses in Sedona and Audree stated, in part, yes. Gerhard Mayer then asked if they thought it would be a great idea to have them close to where they work and Audree stated absolutely, but now it is very difficult with our land cost . . . Gerhard Mayer interrupted to say that the land cost is one, but the vertical structure is the same -- the cost.

Audree explained that the Housing Commission has discussed with the City Council the concept of partnering with a non-profit, such as Habitat for Humanity, where they assume the construction costs or get the materials donated or get the volunteers to build the structure, so it really reduces the construction costs. Gerhard Mayer asked if it is apartment buildings or single-family and Audree indicated that it could be anything. Gerhard Mayer then asked if it would make more sense to have apartments, because most of the people who work here aren't big families, and Audree Juhlin said that is correct, because less than 4% of our housing stock is apartments and that is a great need in the community in her opinion. Gerhard Mayer then commented that there are a lot of singles and Audree Juhlin noted that the Commission did find in the Housing Study that a lot of the homes are single occupants.

Marty Losoff indicated that he had previously talked with staff, because there is going to be a negative reaction to this; there has been already. People who have seen this presentation are saying that gated communities and homeowners' associations are being excluded, so affordable housing is being dumped into their neighborhoods, etc., so does the state say that you have to have a map, if we use City money to purchase property? Audree Juhlin said yes, and Marty then stated that he had suggested that the map include places like the Cultural Park, etc., if in the future, the City is going to buy land, and then it would be an easier sell. When you first see the map, it is like don't put it in my community, but if you include public property like the Cultural Park, the Preserves, etc., and say the City may buy them in the future, it might be an easier sell to the public.

Audree Juhlin explained that the Housing Commission has a number of properties identified, including Lomacasi and some of the creekside area, as well as the Cultural Park, as options for the City Council to consider. The problem is that the Commission only has \$200,000 and we aren't going to get very much with \$200,000, so realistically . . . Marty Losoff interrupted to say no, but if you are just going to sell it to the community as affordable housing. . . Audree Juhlin explained that it actually can't be called "affordable housing" -- the state law calls it Housing Development Areas; however, Marty added that is perception. Audree then explained that based on the last joint meeting with the City Council, the Housing Commission was asked to come back with a sunset clause, so whether it is once the \$200,000 is spent or it is just after two or three years, the map would no longer be in existence.

Gerhard Mayer asked how many units and Audree Juhlin explained that would depend on what they can get for \$200,000, and the Housing Commission is frustrated, because the cost of land is now starting to increase, so they are missing windows of opportunity.

Mike Bower asked how often the City could regenerate this map and Audree Juhlin stated as often as . . . Mike then interrupted to point out that it could be turned in now and a piece of land could be purchased, then make a new map next time, so one way to avoid the whole grief is instead of trying to create the criteria, etc., just identify a couple of hunks of land you are after, paint them white, run them up the flagpole, and go buy one, and then sunset that map and do it again, because \$200,000 is not going to get an apartment building. It probably won't build any building, but it may buy one or two pieces of land.

Jim Eaton asked it could be carried over until you can get to some meaningful figure, and Audree Juhlin stated yes, that money has been there for a number of years and we keep rolling it over. Other zoning approvals have taken place, but they haven't begun construction of those projects, so we have approximately another \$200,000 out there if they every construct. Mike Raber added that as the economy rebounds, we might start to see that come in, and Jim Eaton pointed out that it might get to a meaningful figure to invest. Audree explained that when the Commission first started looking at this almost a year ago, they found very small lots of 6,000 sq. ft. for \$25,000 to \$50,000, but they were gone overnight and the City can't operate that quickly, so we were missing those opportunities.

Gerhard Mayer pointed out that the City owns land and Audree Juhlin noted that was discussed as well. Mike Bower added that you don't have that fight as well, like at Posse Grounds and the land on the other side of Soldier Pass; however, Marty Losoff indicated that he had his ear burned off because of that too. It can really generate a lot of reaction; Audree agreed and explained that including the Cultural Park would start tipping it over the 20% maximum, so they would have to talk about deleting some of the rest. Mike Bower questioned the need for 20%, if we only have \$200,000 and the map can be regenerated at will. The smartest political move would be to map a very miniscule amount of town and meet with those people around and on it to gain their agreement, then it is like Max meeting with everybody on Schnebly, because that map would have some teeth then. Max met with every landowner, but if you do this, you can't meet with everyone and it will engender a big debate. Audree noted that it has gone back and forth with Council as well, and the Council's last direction was to be as broad as possible, so it doesn't look like we are targeting Harmony or Coffee Pot or Grasshopper Flats, etc.

Mike Bower stated that if we had a lot of money or if this map had to survive for 10 years, then he would agree, but neither of those things seems to be the case, so he would disagree. John Sather asked if \$200,000 is the number and Audree explained that \$200,000 is all that is allocated in the budget to spend. John Sather then stated that every time affordable housing or whatever comes up, he believes that design is not on the table as a discussion point, and Habitat is not known to have a high-quality design. It is what most people fear, so he would ask them to do two things; one is to look at the affordable housing done by Royal Studios in Alabama, because you will see some of the most stunning architecture built, where people go to see the affordable housing. Secondly, there is a Gold Nugget Awards program put on by the Pacific Coast Builders Conference, called PCBC, and every year they have an affordable housing component, and during the last five years, it has been stunning stuff, and if people see that and discuss this, then they might want it and ask why it couldn't go in Basha's or as a second floor on City Hall. Audree Juhlin agreed and pointed out that students from ASU did some pilot projects, so people could see that what is perceived based on the stereotype of affordable housing might not be the reality. Habitat has also been told that they must adhere to our design standards.

John Sather indicated that some cities don't allow Habitat in because of the design, and students are inexperienced and only know a certain level, so if you want high-quality design, you aren't likely to find it with freshmen or people hawking free stuff; go look at Pyatok. Audree explained that he has been here and helped do some of the design -- they were his students, and Marty added that they came up with really neat designs.

Audree Juhlin then introduced Cari Meyer, who replaced Nick Gioello, and Chairman Thompson expressed the Committee's appreciation for them coming. He then asked what they are taking away from the discussion and Audree indicated that she will be presenting some more ideas to the Housing Commission. She doesn't know that the map relates to the Community Plan, but the in-lieu piece, negotiations with developers and the community benefit of housing should be considered.

Gerhard Mayer suggested looking at some properties that people shy away from developing, because they are steep, etc.; they wouldn't necessarily be a flat lot, but you

might get one a lot cheaper. Audree Juhlin pointed out that while they could get it cheaper, the other side of the coin is that the cost to construct on it increases, which also increases the cost of the home. Marty Losoff asked if there was a reason that the City didn't want to put its own property on the map and Audree Juhlin indicated that she wasn't sure which properties would be most appropriate, and the nine acres on Soldier Pass is probably the only real. . . Mike Bower interjected the suggestion about the roof of City Hall, unless we are still renting it. Audree Juhlin indicated that has been considered.

Barbara Litrell explained that while the \$200,000 is designated for possible land acquisition, it may also be used for rehabilitation of existing properties, so it isn't locked into land acquisition, and Audree Juhlin added that they are leaning toward some rehab over land acquisition; however, Mike Raber noted that it would still have to be within the designated areas, and Mike Bower repeated that they should think hard about simplifying it by mapping a small area, and then for \$200,000 do a nice apartment above GIS to make that a more viable plaza, and then nobody can gripe.

John Sather commented that there are slivers of land throughout the town and if you add design, we might turn affordable housing from the badness into something good. Audree Juhlin explained that the Commission wants to create a showcase for affordable housing.

**6. Discussion regarding future meeting dates and future agenda items.
(5 minutes 4:55 – 5:00 p.m.)
June 19, 2012 – Community Plan Room**

Kathy Levin indicated that seven or eight Committee Members would be available on the 10th, 17th and 24th of July, so we could consider the second and fourth weeks, but July 3rd is out. Chairman Thompson stated that in order not to have two meetings back to back, we should meet in the second and fourth weeks

Barbara Litrell pointed out that the Council meets the second and fourth weeks, and the Chairman stated that they weren't sure about the starting time, but we will meet on the second and fourth Tuesdays in July. Additionally as we go forward, we will decide whether or not we are going to meet and how or if we are just going to have work sessions with Mike and John, etc. We want to allow ourselves to be in more of a reactionary mode to their needs for the next month or so. Mike Bower added that they are planning on publishing a schedule; they are waiting on John Sather to resolve something about China, and then they will lock in a bunch of dates and publish them. Some of the times, it might be good to agendize it, so more than three could be here together. The idea was that you could come at will, but if more than three come, somebody has to leave. Mike Raber clarified that a quorum is six, and Chairman Thompson stated that the Committee is having a hard time getting a quorum to the meetings, so he isn't going to worry about it. If he shows up and is the seventh person, he will go, and Mike Raber added that if it becomes something like a Working Team, then. . . Kathy interrupted to say that you don't have a quorum then.

7. Adjournment.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 5:11 p.m., without objection.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the meeting of the Citizens Steering Committee held on June 5, 2012.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Recording Secretary*

Date